

HCS HB 2155 -- REIMBURSEMENT OF COSTS FOR UTILITY FACILITY  
RELOCATION

SPONSOR: Hurlbert

COMMITTEE ACTION: Voted "Do Pass with HCS" by the Standing  
Committee on General Laws by a vote of 8 to 4.

The following is a summary of the House Committee Substitute for  
HB 2155.

This bill requires counties, municipalities, and the Missouri  
Department of Transportation to reimburse non-rate-regulated  
utility providers, including telecommunications, Internet, and  
cable providers, for facility relocation due to road maintenance,  
construction, or other right-of-way work activity, and must  
include the cost of labor.

The bill also requires a county, city, incorporated town, or  
village to notify non-rate-regulated utility providers which have  
permitted infrastructure within a planned or existing public  
right-of-way within 90 days after a road project is added to the  
project schedule that may require the provider to relocate its  
infrastructure for the road project. The required notification  
must include certain information, as specified in the bill.

This bill is similar to HCS HB 661 (2025).

The following is a summary of the public testimony from the  
committee hearing. The testimony was based on the introduced  
version of the bill.

PROPOSERS: Supporters say that currently, the costs related to  
relocation are absorbed by the utility company, which in turn  
passes those costs on to the consumer. However, if companies  
bear these costs, it will disincentivize them from bringing their  
services to that part of the state. Supporters further state  
that if surrounding states pass more favorable laws, utility  
providers will conduct their business there instead of Missouri.  
Supporters also state that currently when a political subdivision  
orders a utility to relocate its infrastructure, the consumer  
ends up paying for all of it in the end.

Testifying in person for the bill were Representative Hurlbert;  
David Stokes, Show-Me Institute; MCTA (The Internet & Television  
Assoc. For Mo); Michael Zarrilli, Charter Communications;  
Missouri Broadband Providers Assn.; Associated Industries of

Missouri; Missouri Chamber of Commerce & Industry; and Missouri Electric Cooperatives.

OPPONENTS: Those who oppose the bill say that passage of this bill would be an unfunded mandate to taxpayers, especially since many of those taxpayers may not even be customers of the utility company (such as cable or internet, as opposed to sewer services). Opponents further state that State law requires that each utility be treated equally with no discrimination as to the type of service provided, but that entities such as broadband cannot be taxed. This results in the company bearing the full cost of relocation, which in turn means that the cost gets passed on to the consumer or taxpayer.

Testifying in person against the bill were Missourians For Transportation Investment; Municipal League of Metro StL; Missouri Association of Counties; Site Improvement Association; City of St. Peters; AGC of Missouri; City of Springfield; City of Maryland Heights; City Of Columbia; Missouri Municipal League; Missouri Association of Municipal Utilities; Eric Landwehr, Cole County Public Works; City of Nevada; City of Lee's Summit; Elliot Brown, City of Chesterfield; Mo Assoc. of Counties; City of Warrensburg; St. Charles County; Arnie C. Dienoff; and Missouri Concrete Association.

OTHERS: Others testifying on the bill say that utility companies can make use of easements near highways for free, which means that it is state revenue that is expended on relocation projects.

Testifying in person on the bill was Eric Schroeter, MoDOT.

Written testimony has been submitted for this bill. The full written testimony and witnesses testifying online can be found under Testimony on the bill page on the House website.